



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ate knowledge pertaining to this aspect of these than of any other animals. A large portion of that knowledge is unpublished and hence available only for the observers themselves and their few personal acquaintances.

I wish to point out that this kind of knowledge is the very essence of analytical biology. True analysis in science begins with what is "given"—with the original data. Now the data of biology are the organisms, *the plants and the animals as they occur in nature*. We can learn much, very much, about animals by killing them and taking them to pieces to study their bodily parts; but nature does not give us dead animals to start with. They have to be living before they can be dead.

So, too, we can learn much about the ways of animals by studying confined—"tamed"—ones; but these again are not what nature furnishes in the first instance. The study of zoology must per force *begin* with the animals of the forests, the mountains, the plains, and the waters.

To leave generalities and come to practical matters, my main points are: (1) that steps ought to be taken to correlate the efforts of ornithologists and to put their results into more permanent and available form; and (2) that these steps should be taken from the standpoint and needs of general biology as well as of ornithology.

The carrying out of such a project would require much time, thought, labor and money; but the general lines on which it ought to run would seem tolerably obvious. A central board or bureau, not too large, but still thoroly representative, would be needed as the medium for general direction and final finishing-off of the real work, viz, that done in the field by the numerous individual observers.

This "thoroly representative" board would need to be made up somewhat as follows: Of one or more persons whose interests are birds first and foremost; of someone who has made animal psychology and behaviour generally, his main object of study; and of some one of the broadest possible biological horizon.

Besides these elements in the make-up of the board (which might be designated as professional), managerial, editorial and financiering skill would have to be secured in some way; that is, either as combined with the professional elements, or as independent elements.

I believe there are great possibilities in some such scheme, vague and cumbersome as it may look at first sight.

It is, however, not worth while to enter upon detailed discussions until there is evidence that it would appeal widely and easily to students of animate nature. It is too protean an idea to be realized thru the enthusiasm and push of one or a few persons, unless indeed unlimited time and perseverance were among the endowments of such persons.

*University of California, Berkeley.*

## FROM FIELD AND STUDY

**Louisiana Water-Thrush in California.**—On August 17, 1908, while passing the time between trains at the station of Mecca, Riverside County, in search of the English Sparrow to determine its western progress along the Southern Pacific Route, I took an adult male of the Louisiana Water-Thrush (*Seiurus motacilla*) on the station ground among the water tank cars. Am I right in considering this a record case for the locality if not for the State?

Mecca is situated in the Salton sink at an elevation (?) of two hundred feet below the sea and within one and one-half miles of the present Salton Sea. The shores of Salton Sea are very bar-

ren at this point. The vegetation of the desert, saltbush (*Atriplex*) and mesquite (*Prosopis*) in scrubby form being the only vegetation noticeable except where the pumping plant of some rancher has made an oasis. At the station yard, however, a four inch well pipe has been sunk to a depth of eleven hundred and fifty feet where an artesian stratum was tapped which forces a gentle flow from the top of the pipe which overhangs the tank car siding. This small but constant leakage has nurtured a small grove of cottonwoods and a very limited tule patch.

The bird was first noted hopping about the trucks and platforms of the tank cars and was finally taken from the timbers of the tank support. The bird gave only its call note but this was heard repeatedly. The actions were those described by Chapman and others as being so characteristic. The teetering action and stout shanks remind one forcibly of the Dippers.

The bird flushed several times and seemed not at all shy tho restless as is its habit. Whether or not the same bird was seen each time is impossible to tell. Time did not permit very extensive or prolonged search after the one specimen was taken. Plumage was complete and testes inactive. The identification I feel to be unquestionable as the bird fits perfectly the careful description and measurements of Chapman in his "Warblers of North America."

It seems quite unusual to find this bird of the southeastern swamp and thicket so out of his sphere as to associate intimately with the Abert Towhee and Leconte Thrasher in the midst of a great south-western desert.

If our esteemed editor can assure me of this being a state record I shall be glad to deposit the specimen with the University Museum of Vertebrate Zoology where I consider such record specimens should be preserved.—LOVE HOLMES MILLER, *State Normal School, Los Angeles, Cal.*

[Yes; the specimen is unequivocally *Seiurus motacilla*, and establishes the first record for the species not only for California, but also as far as I know for the whole of the United States west of the Mississippi Valley. In accordance with Mr. Miller's generous offer, the skin has been added to the ornithological collection of the University of California Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, and is number 1105.—J. G.]

**Late Nesting of the Green-backed Goldfinch.**—On September 24, 1908, I took a set of four fresh eggs of the Green-backed Goldfinch from a cypress tree on one of our city streets, disturbing the parent bird from the nest. This seems to me a remarkable occurrence, as my latest previous date for nesting of the species was July 21.—C. S. SHARP, *Escondido, California.*

**The Present Status of the Least Tern in Southern California.**—I have noticed this season that the Least Tern (*Sterna antillarum*) seems to be on the increase at nearly all of the breeding grounds in Southern California.

The colony at Ballona Beach (this is the narrow strip of sand between Del Rey and Ocean Park) is nearly double what it was last year. As nearly as I could count, I should say that there were about 125 pairs of nesting birds. I watched this pretty closely, and do not think that more than ten per cent hatched because of the depredations of dogs mostly, and of small boys. This colony will surely disappear, and why the birds keep coming back I cannot see, as the whole thing (both island and mainland being cut up into building lots) is rapidly being built up with summer cottages. Some of the nests were not more than a hundred yards from the houses.

The Redondo Beach colony seems this year to be deserted. I noticed a few birds flying around, but no nests. This used to be a big colony, but the building of so many houses has driven the birds away.

The colonies at Bolsa Beach and Newport Beach were very thickly inhabited. The birds were there by the thousands, and I found it impossible to count them. The colony at Bolsa Beach is mostly within the grounds of the Bolsa Chica Gun Club and ought to increase every year, as the gun club people allow no one on the grounds. I should say that fully seventy-five per cent of the birds in this colony raised two or three broods.

The Newport Beach colony is split up into two or three main colonies, and this year a new one was started on a lot of reclaimed land. The land company had dredged the channels and filled a salt marsh up with the sand taken out where the channels were cut. This formed a nice white patch of sand and shells where the Terns made themselves perfectly at home. This colony probably succeeded in hatching sixty per cent of its eggs.

Both the Bolsa Beach and the Newport Beach colonies have increased about fifty percent over last year. The electric cars run directly thru the Bolsa Beach colony and the terns get so used to them that they very seldom leave their nests when a car passes.—W. LEE CHAMBERS, *Santa Monica, California*

**Subspecific Names in the Genus *Passerella*.**—According to the decision of the A. O. U. Committee, as stated in the Fourteenth Supplement (*Auk* XXV, July 1908, p. 395), the Fox Sparrow from Yakutat Bay should not be recognized in nomenclature as different from the Fox

Sparrow of Kadiak Island. In other words, *Passerella iliaca meruloides* (Vigors) [= *P. i. annectens* RIDGWAY] and *P. i. insularis* RIDGWAY are lumped together. To quote: "Both *annectens* and *meruloides* are believed to represent one form, which is inseparable from *P. i. insularis*". However that may be, it is certainly a mistake to discard the name *meruloides*, which has some sixty years priority over either of the other names and is without a shadow of a doubt applicable to the Yakutat form. (See CONDOR IV, March 1902, p. 45.)—J. GRINNELL, *Berkeley, California*.

**Northern Range of the Phainopepla.**—*Phainopepla nitens* has been recorded along the foothills of the Sierras at various places north as far as Marysville, but previous to my observations the northern limit in the Coast Range was Mt. Hamilton where R. H. Beck noted one bird in November, 1899, and Ernest Adams also recorded a bird from near the same place on October 28, 1898. Joseph Mailliard reports having heard their note in Marin County, but has never seen a bird.

On June 23, 1907, while in the Arroyo Mocho in southern Alameda County, I saw six of these birds which I took to be a family of four young and their parents. On April 1, 1908, near the same place I again saw a pair of Phainopeplas, but failed to secure either bird. Later in the year, however, while doing extended geological work in the Arroyo Mocho I again met with the birds several times, and I believed several pairs to have raised broods this last summer.

A number of birds were seen at dusk on July 21, 1908, and one young male of the year was taken, thus proving the birds to be breeding in Alameda County which probably marks their most northerly limit.—J. R. PEMBERTON, *Stanford University, California*.

**Pacific Fulmars and Pacific Kittiwakes at Long Beach.**—During February, 1908, I observed several Pacific Fulmars (*Fulmarus glacialis glupischa*), both light and dark phases, about the pleasure wharf at Long Beach, California. These birds were exceedingly tame, swimming about within a few inches of the numerous fish-lines and often making a dash for the baited hooks as the fishermen cast them. Upon tossing a handful of fish scraps overboard I was surprised to see the fulmars dive for the sinking pieces, sometimes going two or three feet under water and bouncing almost clear of the surface upon returning. They were also somewhat quarrelsome, fighting fiercely over a fish, uttering a harsh, rasping note the while. Several Pacific Kittiwakes (*Rissa t. pollicaris*) were also observed here.—C. B. LINTON, *Long Beach, Cal.*

**The European Chaffinch at Berkeley, California.**—On May 14, 1908, while passing a garden in Berkeley, near the corner of Prospect Street and Channing Way, my attention was attracted by an unfamiliar song, and on stopping to ascertain the source, I was surprised to see a European Chaffinch (*Fringilla caelebs*), in full plumage, singing cheerily in the lower branches of an acacia tree. The bird was not more than ten feet distant and repeated his song three times in full view, so that there was no mistake in identification. He had probably escaped from an aviary in the neighborhood but seemed to be as much at home as any of the native birds and, despite the raw, drizzling weather, was singing as merrily as a house finch. Notes of this kind are perhaps worth recording as they may be useful in future in tracing the introduction of foreign birds which may become acclimated in certain localities.—T. S. PALMER, *Washington, D. C.*

**The California Record of the Cape Robin Open to Question.**—I recently visited the home of Mr. W. Otto Emerson, at Haywards, California, and was accorded the privilege of closely examining several of the record specimens in his extensive private collection. I was particularly interested in scrutinizing the skin of "*Merula confinis*", upon which (and it alone) rests the inclusion of the Cape Robin as a bird of California. This bird is a female, No. 159 (Coll. W. O. E.), and was secured by Mr. Emerson himself at Haywards, January 7, 1882. It was first recorded in *Zoe*, Vol. I, April 1890, p. 46.

I was at once impressed with the similarity between it and certain pale female examples of the Western Robin. Mr. Emerson and I proceeded to analyze its characters. A male of true *confinis*, from Sierra de Laguna, lower California, was at hand for comparison. It was found that the Haywards bird, altho a female, was not so pale as the Lower California bird. The breast of the former showed a decided reddish caste, of the same quality as in females of ordinary *propinqua* tho not so deep. The head of the Haywards "*confinis*" was colored exactly as in female specimens of *propinqua*, the superciliary stripe being not continuous but broken as in the latter, and the feathers on the top of the head being decidedly black-centered, also as in the latter. The white area on the belly of the Haywards bird was found to be no more extensive than in female examples of *propinqua*, and the bills were identical in size, outline and color. The only character left, then, by which to identify the Haywards bird with true *confinis* was the decidedly ashy dorsal surface. But this, in absence of the other characteristics, Mr. Emerson and I agreed to be

insufficient in itself to warrant calling the bird *Merula confinis*. In other words, the Haywards "Cape Robin", is a pale individual extreme of the Western Robin (*Merula migratoria propinqua*).—J. GRINNELL, *Berkeley, California*.

**Early Record for *Passerculus rostratus* in Los Angeles County.**—On August 18, 1908, I secured a female *P. rostratus* in the marsh at Alamitos Bay, Los Angeles County, California. I observed two or three others on this date and by September 1 they were quite common.—C. B. LINTON, *Long Beach, California*.

**Notes on the Western Gnatcatcher.**—The Western Gnatcatcher (*Poliophtila caerulea obscura*) has appeared this summer over its breeding range in Central California in larger numbers than ever before, and has visited localities where previously unknown.

At Fyffe, El Dorado County, it had been noted by Barlow in June, but in no numbers. This year, however, it was a very common bird and no less than eight pairs of birds were observed nesting at Fyffe, and three sets of eggs were taken by H. W. Carriger and myself. Mr. Carriger in his three previous trips from Placerville to Fyffe had never seen a bird along the stage road, yet this year its note could be heard nearly everywhere, and seven specimens were taken over a range of twelve miles.

On March 22, 1908, near Point San Pedro, San Mateo County, I took a male gnatcatcher, thus making a record for this county.

In Alameda County, where observations were made over March, April, July and August, these birds were abundant nearly everywhere in the bushy regions and specimens of all ages were taken. Mr. W. Otto Emerson, probably the best posted man on Alameda County ornithology, can only report two instances of this bird having occurred in the county over a long period of years.

From the data thus taken from the widely separated localities mentioned, it would appear that the species has made a very large migration northward this last summer and I should like to hear of its occurrence in other localities this year.—J. R. PEMBERTON, *Stanford University, California*.



BOHLMAN AND FINLEY IN CAMP ON A FLOATING TULE ISLAND, DURING THEIR  
EXPLORATION OF LOWER KLAMATH LAKE, SUMMER OF 1908